arXiv:1511.02094v1 [math.FA] 6 Nov 2015

CARTESIAN DECOMPOSITION AND NUMERICAL RADIUS INEQUALITIES

FUAD KITTANEH[1], MOHAMMAD SAL MOSLEHIAN[2] AND TAKEAKI YAMAZAKI[3]

Abstract. We show that if $T = H + iK$ is the Cartesian decomposition of $T \in \mathbb{B}(\mathscr{H})$, then for $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{R}$, $\sup_{\alpha^2+\beta^2=1} \|\alpha H + \beta K\| = w(T)$. We then apply it to prove that if $A, B, X \in \mathbb{B}(\mathscr{H})$ and $0 \le mI \le X$, then

$$\begin{aligned} m\|\mathrm{Re}(A) - \mathrm{Re}(B)\| &\le w(\mathrm{Re}(A)X - X\mathrm{Re}(B)) \\ &\le \frac{1}{2}\sup_{\theta\in\mathbb{R}} \big\|(AX - XB) + e^{i\theta}(XA - BX)\big\| \\ &\le \frac{\|AX - XB\| + \|XA - BX\|}{2}, \end{aligned}$$

where $\mathrm{Re}(T)$ denotes the real part of an operator T. A refinement of the triangle inequality is also shown.

1. Introduction

Let $\mathbb{B}(\mathscr{H})$ be the C^*-algebra of all bounded linear operators on a complex Hilbert space $(\mathscr{H}, \langle\cdot,\cdot\rangle)$ and I stand for the identity operator. If $\dim \mathscr{H} = n$, we identify $\mathbb{B}(\mathscr{H})$ with the space $\mathcal{M}_n$ of all $n\times n$ matrices with entries in the complex field and denote its identity by I_n. Any operator $T \in \mathbb{B}(\mathscr{H})$ can be represented as $T = H+iK$, the so-called Cartesian decomposition, where $H = \mathrm{Re}(T) = \frac{T+T^*}{2}$ and $K = \mathrm{Im}(T) = \frac{T-T^*}{2i}$ are called the real and imaginary parts of T. An operator $A \in \mathbb{B}(\mathscr{H})$ is called positive, denoted by $A \ge 0$, if $\langle Ax, x\rangle \ge 0$ for all $x \in \mathscr{H}$. For $p \ge 1$, the Schatten p-class, denoted by $\mathcal{C}_p$, is defined to be the two-sided ideal in $\mathbb{B}(\mathscr{H})$ of those compact operators A for which $\|A\|_p = \mathrm{tr}(|A|^p)^{1/p}$ is finite, where the symbol tr denotes the usual trace. This norm as well as the usual operator norm $\|\cdot\|$ are typical examples of unitarily invariant norms, i.e., a norm $|||\cdot|||$ defined on a two-sided ideal $\mathcal{C}_{||||\cdot|||}$ of $\mathbb{B}(\mathscr{H})$ satisfying $|||UAV||| = |||A|||$ for all $A \in \mathcal{C}_{||||\cdot|||}$ and all unitaries $U, V \in \mathbb{B}(\mathscr{H})$. The numerical radius of $A \in \mathbb{B}(\mathscr{H})$ is defined by

$$w(A) = \sup\{|\langle Ax, x\rangle| : x \in \mathscr{H}, \|x\| = 1\}.$$

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 47A12, 47A30, 47A63, 47B47.

Key words and phrases. Numerical radius; positive operator; Cartesian decomposition; triangle inequality.

It is well known that $w(\cdot)$ defines a norm on $\mathbb{B}(\mathscr{H})$ such that for all $A \in \mathbb{B}(\mathscr{H})$,

$$\frac{1}{2}\|A\| \leq w(A) \leq \|A\|. \tag{1.1}$$

If A is self-adjoint, then $w(A) = \|A\|$ and if $A^2 = 0$, then $w(A) = \frac{\|A\|}{2}$(see e.g., [6] and [9]). Of course, $w(\cdot)$ is not unitarily invariant, rather it satisfies $w(U^*AU) = w(A)$ for all A and all unitary U in $\mathbb{B}(\mathscr{H})$, i.e., $w(\cdot)$ is weakly unitarily invariant.

Some interesting numerical radius inequalities improving inequalities (1.1) have been obtained by several mathematicians (see [1], [5], [6], [13], and references therein). Several investigations on norm and numerical radius inequalities involving the Cartesian decomposition may be found in the literature, among them we would like to refer the reader to [4] and [7].

In this note, we show that if $T = H + iK$ is the Cartesian decomposition of $T \in \mathbb{B}(\mathscr{H})$, then for $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{R}$, $\sup_{\alpha^2+\beta^2=1} \|\alpha H + \beta K\| = w(T)$. We then apply it to find upper and lower bounds for $w(\mathrm{Re}(A)X - X\mathrm{Re}(B))$, where $A, B, X \in \mathbb{B}(\mathscr{H})$ and $0 \leq mI \leq X$. Furthermore, we present a refinement of the triangle inequality.

2. Results

We start this section with a result concerning the Cartesian decomposition.

Theorem 2.1. *Let $T = H + iK$ be the Cartesian decomposition of $T \in \mathbb{B}(\mathscr{H})$. Then for $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{R}$,*

$$\sup_{\alpha^2+\beta^2=1} \|\alpha H + \beta K\| = w(T). \tag{2.1}$$

In particular,

$$\frac{1}{2}\|T + T^*\| \leq w(T) \quad \textit{and} \quad \frac{1}{2}\|T - T^*\| \leq w(T). \tag{2.2}$$

Proof. First of all, we note that

$$w(T) = \sup_{\theta\in\mathbb{R}} \|\mathrm{Re}(e^{i\theta}T)\|. \tag{2.3}$$

In fact, $\sup_{\theta\in\mathbb{R}} \mathrm{Re}\left(e^{i\theta}\langle Tx, x\rangle\right) = |\langle Tx, x\rangle|$ yields that

$$\sup_{\theta\in\mathbb{R}} \|\mathrm{Re}(e^{i\theta}T)\| = \sup_{\theta\in\mathbb{R}} w(\mathrm{Re}(e^{i\theta}T)) = w(T).$$

On the other hand, let $T = H + iK$ be the Cartesian decomposition of T. Then

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{Re}(e^{i\theta}T) &= \frac{e^{i\theta}T + e^{-i\theta}T^*}{2} = \frac{1}{2}\{(\cos\theta + i\sin\theta)T + (\cos\theta - i\sin\theta)T^*\} \\ &= (\cos\theta)\,\frac{T+T^*}{2} - (\sin\theta)\,\frac{T-T^*}{2i} = (\cos\theta)\,H - (\sin\theta)\,K. \qquad (2.4)\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, by putting $\alpha = \cos\theta$ and $\beta = -\sin\theta$ in (2.4), we obtain (2.1). Especially, by setting $(\alpha, \beta) = (1, 0)$ and $(\alpha, \beta) = (0, 1)$, we reach (2.2). □

Remark 2.2. *By using (2.2), we get some known inequalities:*

(i) $\|T\| = \|H + iK\| \le \|H\| + \|K\| \le 2w(T)$. *Hence we have* $\frac{1}{2}\|T\| \le w(T)$.

(ii) *If* $T = T^*$, *then* $T = H$. *Hence we have* $\|T\| = \|H\| \le w(T) \le \|T\|$ *and* $w(T) = \|T\|$.

(iii) *By easy calculation, we have* $\frac{T^*T+TT^*}{2} = H^2 + K^2$. *Hence,*

$$\frac{1}{4}\|T^*T + TT^*\| = \frac{1}{2}\|H^2 + K^2\| \le \frac{1}{2}(\|H\|^2 + \|K\|^2) \le w^2(T) \quad (\textit{see also } [11]).$$

(iv) *Let* $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{R}$ *satisfy* $\alpha^2 + \beta^2 = 1$. *Then for any unit vector* $x \in \mathscr{H}$, *we have*

$$\begin{aligned}\|(\alpha H + \beta K)x\| &= \left\| \begin{bmatrix} H & K \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \alpha x \\ \beta x \end{bmatrix} \right\| \le \left\| \begin{bmatrix} H & K \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \right\| = \left\| \begin{bmatrix} H & K \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} H & 0 \\ K & 0 \end{bmatrix} \right\|^{\frac{1}{2}} \\ &= \|H^2 + K^2\|^{\frac{1}{2}} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\|T^*T + TT^*\|^{\frac{1}{2}}.\end{aligned}$$

Hence we have $w^2(T) = \sup_{\alpha^2+\beta^2=1} \|\alpha H + \beta K\|^2 \le \frac{1}{2}\|T^*T + TT^*\|$ (*see also* [11]).

We can obtain a refinement of the triangle inequality as follows.

Theorem 2.3. *Let* $A, B \in \mathbb{B}(\mathscr{H})$. *Then*

$$\|A + B\| \le 2w\left(\begin{bmatrix} 0 & A \\ B^* & 0 \end{bmatrix}\right) \le \|A\| + \|B\|.$$

Proof. Let $T = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & A \\ B^* & 0 \end{bmatrix}$ on $\mathscr{H} \oplus \mathscr{H}$. Then by (2.2) and (2.3), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|A+B\| &= \|T+T^*\| \\ &\le 2w(T) \\ &= \sup_{\theta\in\mathbb{R}} 2\|\mathrm{Re}(e^{i\theta}T)\| \\ &= \sup_{\theta\in\mathbb{R}} \left\| \begin{bmatrix} 0 & e^{i\theta}A + e^{-i\theta}B \\ e^{-i\theta}A^* + e^{i\theta}B^* & 0 \end{bmatrix} \right\| \\ &= \sup_{\theta\in\mathbb{R}} \|e^{i\theta}A + e^{-i\theta}B\| \ (\text{since } \left\| \begin{bmatrix} 0 & C \\ C^* & 0 \end{bmatrix} \right\| = \|C\|\,) \\ &\le \|A\| + \|B\|. \end{aligned}$$

□

Thus we observe that equality occurs in the triangle inequality for the operator norm if and only if the two equalities

$$w\left(\begin{bmatrix} 0 & A \\ B^* & 0 \end{bmatrix}\right) + w\left(\begin{bmatrix} 0 & B \\ A^* & 0 \end{bmatrix}\right) = w\left(\begin{bmatrix} 0 & A+B \\ A^*+B^* & 0 \end{bmatrix}\right)$$

and

$$w\left(\begin{bmatrix} 0 & A \\ B^* & 0 \end{bmatrix}\right) = w\left(\begin{bmatrix} 0 & A \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}\right) + w\left(\begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ B^* & 0 \end{bmatrix}\right)$$

occur in the triangle inequality for the norm $w(\cdot)$.

Example 2.4. *Let* $A = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$, $B = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & -1 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$, *and* $T = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & A \\ B^* & 0 \end{bmatrix}$. *Then* $\|A+B\| < 2w(T) < \|A\| + \|B\|$.

To see this, we need the fact [2] *that "if* $A, B \in \mathbb{B}(\mathscr{H})$ *are non-zero, then the equation* $\|A+B\| = \|A\| + \|B\|$ *holds if and only if* $\|A\|\|B\| \in \overline{W(A^*B)}$*".*

It is clear that $\|A+B\| = 1$. *Let* $x = \frac{1}{2}[i\ 1\ 1\ 1]^t \in \mathbb{C}^4$. *Then* $\|x\| = 1$ *and* $|\langle Tx, x\rangle| = \frac{\sqrt{10}}{4}$. *Hence* $\|A+B\| = 1 < \frac{\sqrt{10}}{2} \le 2w(T)$. *On the other hand, assume that* $2w(T) = \|A\| + \|B\|$. *Then by Theorem 2.3, there exists* $\theta \in \mathbb{R}$ *such that* $\|e^{i\theta}A + e^{-i\theta}B\| = \|A\| + \|B\|$. *So, by the above fact, we have* $\|A\|\|B\| \in \overline{W(e^{-2i\theta}A^*B)}$, *and it is equivalent to* $e^{2i\theta}\|A\|\|B\| \in \overline{W(A^*B)}$. *Since* $w(A^*B) \le \|A^*B\| \le \|A\|\|B\|$, *we have* $w(A^*B) = \|A\|\|B\|$. *However,* $\|A\|\|B\| = \frac{3+\sqrt{5}}{2}$ *and*

$$w(A^*B) = w\left(\begin{bmatrix} 0 & -1 \\ 0 & -1 \end{bmatrix}\right) = \frac{1+\sqrt{2}}{2}$$

(*see e.g.,* [8, *Example* 3 *in Section* 2.5.1]). *Hence* $w(A^*B) < \|A\|\|B\|$, *which leads to a contradiction. Hence* $2w(T) = \sup_{\theta\in\mathbb{R}} \|e^{i\theta}A + e^{-i\theta}B\| < \|A\| + \|B\|$, *and so the inequalities in Theorem 2.3 can be strict.*

The following lemma is known in the literature.

Lemma 2.5. [12, Lemma 3.1] *Let* $X \geq mI > 0$ *for some positive real number* m *and* Y *be in the associate ideal corresponding to a unitarily invariant norm* $|||\cdot|||$. *Then*

$$m|||Y||| \leq \frac{1}{2}|||YX + XY|||\,.$$

The next assertion is interesting on its own right (see also [3]).

Proposition 2.6. *Let* $A, B \in \mathbb{B}(\mathscr{H})$ *be self-adjoint and* $0 < mI \leq X$ *for some positive real number* m. *Then*

$$m\|A - B\| \leq w(AX - XB) \leq \|AX - XB\|. \tag{2.5}$$

Proof. Let $T = AX - XB$. Then $T + T^* = (A - B)X + X(A - B)$. It follows from Lemma 2.5 that

$$m\|A - B\| \leq \frac{1}{2}\|(A - B)X + X(A - B)\| = \frac{1}{2}\|T + T^*\| \leq w(T) = w(AX - XB).$$

The second inequality of (2.5) follows from (1.1). □

Proposition 2.6 improves Theorem 1 in [3] for the usual operator norm, which says that $m\|A - B\| \leq \|AX - XB\|$.

In the setting of matrices, it is known that for $A \in \mathcal{M}_n$, we have

$$\|A\| \leq \|A\|_p,$$

and so

$$w(A) \leq \|A\|_p\,.$$

Using (2.5) and the fact that $\|A\|_p \leq \|A\|\,\|I_n\|_p$, we infer the next result.

Proposition 2.7. *Let* $A, B, X \in \mathbb{M}_n$ *be Hermitian and* $0 < mI_n \leq X$ *for some positive real number* m. *Then* $\frac{m}{n^{1/p}}\|A - B\|_p \leq w(AX - XB) \leq \|AX - XB\|_p\,.$

An extension of Proposition 2.6 to arbitrary (i.e., not necessarily self-adjoint) operators A, B can be stated as follows.

Theorem 2.8. *Let* $A, B \in \mathbb{B}(\mathscr{H})$ *and* $0 < mI \leq X$ *for some positive real number* m. *Then*

$$m\|A-B\| \leq w\left(\begin{bmatrix} 0 & AX - XB \\ A^*X - XB^* & 0 \end{bmatrix}\right) \leq \frac{\|AX - XB\| + \|A^*X - XB^*\|}{2}. \tag{2.6}$$

Proof. Applying Proposition 2.6 to the self-adjoint operators $\hat{A} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & A \\ A^* & 0 \end{bmatrix}$, $\hat{B} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & B \\ B^* & 0 \end{bmatrix}$, and the positive operator $\hat{X} = \begin{bmatrix} X & 0 \\ 0 & X \end{bmatrix}$ on $\mathscr{H} \oplus \mathscr{H}$, we have

$$m\|\hat{A} - \hat{B}\| \leq w\left(\hat{A}\hat{X} - \hat{X}\hat{B}\right).$$

Thus,

$$m\|A - B\| \leq w\left(\begin{bmatrix} 0 & AX - XB \\ A^*X - XB^* & 0 \end{bmatrix}\right).$$

This proves the first inequality in (2.6). To prove the second inequality in (2.6), use the triangle inequality for $w(\cdot)$ and the fact that $w\left(\begin{bmatrix} 0 & AX - XB \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}\right) = \frac{\|AX - XB\|}{2}$ and $w\left(\begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ A^*X - XB^* & 0 \end{bmatrix}\right) = \frac{\|A^*X - XB^*\|}{2}$. □

It should be mentioned here that (2.5) follows as a special case of (2.6) by recalling that $w\left(\begin{bmatrix} 0 & C \\ C & 0 \end{bmatrix}\right) = w(C)$ (see, e.g., [10]).

It follows from Corollary 5 in [3] that if $U, V \in \mathbb{B}(\mathscr{H})$ are unitary and $0 < mI \leq X$ for some positive real number m, then

$$m\|U - V\| \leq \|UX - XV\|. \tag{2.7}$$

A refinement of (2.7) is given in the following corollary.

Corollary 2.9. *Let $U, V \in \mathbb{B}(\mathscr{H})$ be unitary and $0 < mI \leq X$ for some positive real number m. Then*

$$m\|U - V\| \leq w\left(\begin{bmatrix} 0 & UX - XV \\ U^*X - XV^* & 0 \end{bmatrix}\right) \leq \|UX - XV\|. \tag{2.8}$$

Proof. The second inequality in (2.8) follows from by the unitary invariance of $\|\cdot\|$. In fact, $\|U^*X - XV^*\| = \|U^*(XV - UX)V^*\| = \|XV - UX\| = \|UX - XV\|$. □

Finally, we present another extension of Proposition 2.6 to arbitrary operators A, B. To achieve it, we need the following lemma. It immediately follows from

the relations

$$\begin{aligned} w(X+Y) &= w\left(\begin{bmatrix} 0 & X+Y \\ X+Y & 0 \end{bmatrix}\right) \leq w\left(\begin{bmatrix} 0 & X \\ Y & 0 \end{bmatrix}\right) + w\left(\begin{bmatrix} 0 & Y \\ X & 0 \end{bmatrix}\right) \\ &= 2w\left(\begin{bmatrix} 0 & X \\ Y & 0 \end{bmatrix}\right). \end{aligned}$$

Lemma 2.10. [10, Theorem 2.4] *If $X, Y \in \mathbb{B}(\mathscr{H})$, then $w(X+Y) \leq 2w\left(\begin{bmatrix} 0 & X \\ Y & 0 \end{bmatrix}\right)$.*

Theorem 2.11. *Let $A, B \in \mathbb{B}(\mathscr{H})$ and $0 < mI \leq X$ for some positive real number m. Then*

$$\begin{aligned} m\|Re(A) - Re(B)\| &\leq w(Re(A)X - XRe(B)) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2}\sup_{\theta\in\mathbb{R}} \left\|(AX - XB) + e^{i\theta}(XA - BX)\right\| \\ &\leq \frac{\|AX - XB\| + \|XA - BX\|}{2}. \end{aligned}$$

Proof. We have

$$\begin{aligned} & m\|\mathrm{Re}(A) - \mathrm{Re}(B)\| \\ & \leq w(\mathrm{Re}(A)X - X\mathrm{Re}(B)) && \text{(by Proposition 2.6)} \\ & = \frac{w\left((AX - XB) + (A^*X - XB^*)\right)}{2} \\ & \leq w\left(\begin{bmatrix} 0 & AX - XB \\ A^*X - XB^* & 0 \end{bmatrix}\right) && \text{(by Lemma 2.10)} \\ & = \sup_{\theta\in\mathbb{R}} \left\|\mathrm{Re}\left(\begin{bmatrix} 0 & e^{i\theta}(AX - XB) \\ e^{i\theta}(A^*X - XB^*) & 0 \end{bmatrix}\right)\right\| && \text{(by (2.3))} \\ & = \frac{1}{2}\sup_{\theta\in\mathbb{R}} \left\|\begin{bmatrix} 0 & e^{i\theta}[(AX - XB) + e^{-2i\theta}(A^*X - XB^*)^*] \\ e^{-i\theta}[(AX - XB) + e^{-2i\theta}(A^*X - XB^*)^*]^* & 0 \end{bmatrix}\right\| \\ & = \frac{1}{2}\sup_{\theta\in\mathbb{R}} \left\|(AX - XB) + e^{-2i\theta}(XA - BX)\right\| \\ & = \frac{1}{2}\sup_{\theta\in\mathbb{R}} \left\|(AX - XB) + e^{i\theta}(XA - BX)\right\| \\ & \leq \frac{\|AX - XB\| + \|XA - BX\|}{2}. \end{aligned}$$

□

References

[1] A. Abu-Omar and F. Kittaneh, *A numerical radius inequality involving the generalized Aluthge transform*, Studia Math. 216 (2013), no. 1, 69–75.

[2] M. Barraa and M. Boumazgour, *Inner derivations and norm equality*, Proc. Amer. Math. Soc. **130** (2002), no. 2, 471–476.

[3] R. Bhatia, C. Davis and F. Kittaneh, *Some inequalities for commutators and an application to spectral variation*, Aequationes Math. **41** (1991), no. 1, 70–78.

[4] R. Bhatia and F. Kittaneh, Cartesian decomposition and Schatten norms, Linear Algebra Appl. **310** (2000), no. 1-3, 109-116.

[5] S. S. Dragomir, *A survey of some recent inequalities for the norm and numerical radius of operators in Hilbert spaces*, Banach J. Math. Anal. **1** (2007), no. 2, 154–175.

[6] S. S. Dragomir, *Inequalities for the numerical radius of linear operators in Hilbert spaces*, Springer Briefs in Mathematics. Springer, Cham, 2013.

[7] M. El-Haddad and F. Kittaneh, *Numerical radius inequalities for Hilbert space operators*, II. Studia Math. **182** (2007), no. 2, 133–140.

[8] T. Furuta, *Invitation to Linear Operators, From matrices to bounded linear operators on a Hilbert space,* Taylor & Francis, Ltd., London, 2001.

[9] K. E. Gustafson and D. K. M. Rao, *Numerical range. The field of values of linear operators and matrices*, Universitext. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1997.

[10] O. Hirzallah, F. Kittaneh and K. Shebrawi, *Numerical radius inequalities for certain* 2×2 *operator matrices*, Integral Equations Operator Theory **71** (2011), no. 1, 129–147.

[11] F. Kittaneh, *Numerical radius inequalities for Hilbert space operators*, Studia Math. **168** (2005), no. 1, 73–80.

[12] J. L. van Hemmen and T. Ando, *An inequality for trace ideals*, Comm. Math. Phys. **76** (1980), no. 2, 143–148.

[13] T. Yamazaki, *On upper and lower bounds of the numerical radius and an equality condition*, Studia Math. **178** (2007), no. 1, 83–89.

[1]Department of Mathematics, The University of Jordan, Amman, Jordan

E-mail address: fkitt@ju.edu.jo

[2] Department of Pure Mathematics, Center Of Excellence in Analysis on Algebraic Structures (CEAAS), Ferdowsi University of Mashhad, P. O. Box 1159, Mashhad 91775, Iran.

E-mail address: moslehian@um.ac.ir

[3] Department of Electrical, Electronic and Computer Engineering, Toyo University, Kawagoe-Shi, Saitama, 350-8585 Japan.

E-mail address: e-mail: t-yamazaki@toyo.jp